

REMARKS

The Examiner has stated that the reply to Office Action filed on September 18, 2006 by the Applicant was not fully responsive to the Office Action dated October 19, 2005 because the reply did not address the objection to the drawings set forth in that Office Action. In the previous Office Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings indicating that the application admits of illustration by a drawing to facilitate understanding of the invention. Specifically, the Examiner indicated that the statement in the specification that "a preferred embodiment of the instant invention is described, in part, with reference to Figures 1 and 2 showing the display and the storage system of the prior art" does not clearly distinguish the elements of the instant invention from the admitted prior art. On page 4 of the Office Action filed April 19, 2006 the Applicant amended the specification to more clearly state the differences in the prior art depicted in Figures 1-3 and the present invention depicted in Figures 4-9. The Applicant has further amended the specification to even more clearly state the differences in the prior art and the present invention.

INVENTOR: SEYMOUR et al.
Serial No. 10/764,977

Reconsideration of the application respectfully is requested. The foregoing remarks are believed to be responsive to every matter raised in the office action. If, however, some matter has been overlooked, an opportunity to correct the oversight would be appreciated. Please charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment with respect to this Amendment to deposit account number 19-3140.

Respectfully submitted,



Bryan P. Stanley
Patent Office Reg. No. 44,352
SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
PO Box #061080
Wacker Drive Station
Sears Tower
Chicago, IL 60606-1080
Telephone: (816) 460-2410
Facsimile: (816) 531-7545

Attorneys for Applicant